

Cross-intersecting integer sequences

Peter Borg

Department of Mathematics, University of Malta
p.borg.02@cantab.net

Abstract

We say that a sequence $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ *meets* a sequence $(b_1, b_2, \dots, b_n)$ if $a_i = b_i$ for some i in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. For any integers $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n$ with $1 \leq c_1 \leq c_2 \leq \dots \leq c_n$, let $S_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)}$ be the set of all integer sequences of the form $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n)$ with $1 \leq a_i \leq c_i$ for each i in $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. We show that if A and B are subsets of $S_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)}$ such that each sequence in A meets each sequence in B , then the product of the sizes of A and B is at most $(c_1 c_2 \dots c_n)^2 / c_1^2$. The bound is attained if each of A and B is the set of all sequences in $S_{(c_1, c_2, \dots, c_n)}$ whose first entry is 1. We obtain this result by proving a cross-intersection theorem for *weighted* sets that is of independent interest and that enables us to generalise the result in various desirable ways.

1 Introduction

Unless otherwise stated, we shall use small letters such as x to denote elements of a set or non-negative integers or functions, capital letters such as X to denote sets, and calligraphic letters such as $\mathcal{F}$ to denote *families* (i.e. sets whose elements are sets themselves). It is to be assumed that arbitrary sets and families are *finite*. We call a set A an r -*element set*, or simply an r -*set*, if its size $|A|$ is r (i.e. if it contains exactly r elements). For a set X , the *power set of X* (i.e. the family of all subsets of X) is denoted by 2^X , and the family of all r -element subsets of X is denoted by $\binom{X}{r}$. The set $\{1, 2, \dots\}$ of all positive integers is denoted by $\mathbb{N}$. For any integer $n \geq 1$, the set $\{1, \dots, n\}$ of the first n positive integers is denoted by $[n]$.

We will represent a sequence $a_1, \dots, a_n$ by an ordered n -tuple $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$. We will say that a sequence $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ *meets* a sequence $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ if $a_i = b_i$ for some i in $[n]$. For any positive integers $c_1, \dots, c_n$, let $S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$ denote the set of all integer sequences $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ such that $1 \leq a_i \leq c_i$ for each i in $[n]$; that is,

$$S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) : a_i \in [c_i] \text{ for each } i \in [n]\}.$$

So $S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$ is the Cartesian product $[c_1] \times \dots \times [c_n]$.

The following is our first result, which we will prove in Section 4.

Theorem 1.1 *If $c_1, \dots, c_n$ are integers, $1 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$, $A, B \subseteq S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$, and each sequence in A meets each sequence in B , then*

$$|A||B| \leq \left(\frac{|S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}|}{c_1} \right)^2 = \left(\frac{1}{c_1} \prod_{i=1}^n c_i \right)^2,$$

and equality holds if $A = B = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} : a_1 = 1\}$.

This is a consequence of a result that we prove in Section 3 and that allows us to generalise this significantly for $c_1 \geq 3$.

For any positive integers $c_1, \dots, c_n$, let $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$ denote the set of all integer sequences $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ such that $0 \leq a_i \leq c_i$ for each i in $[n]$; that is,

$$P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) : a_i \in \{0\} \cup [c_i] \text{ for each } i \in [n]\}.$$

So $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$ is the Cartesian product $(\{0\} \cup [c_1]) \times \dots \times (\{0\} \cup [c_n])$. For any $r \in [n]$, let $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ be the set of all sequences in $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$ that have exactly r non-zero entries; that is,

$$P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)} = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} : |\{i \in [n] : a_i \neq 0\}| = r\}.$$

We will call a sequence in $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ an r -*partial* sequence or simply a *partial* sequence.

Note that $S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} = P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(n)}$.

In general, we will say that $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ *meets* $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ if $a_i = b_i$ for some i (where obviously i is at most the minimum of m and n). We will say that $(a_1, \dots, a_m)$ *meets* $(b_1, \dots, b_n)$ *properly* if $a_i = b_i \neq 0$ for some i .

In Section 4 we will also prove the following general result.

Theorem 1.2 *Let $c_1, \dots, c_m, d_1, \dots, d_n$ be integers such that $3 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_m$ and $3 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$. Let $r \in [m]$ and $s \in [n]$. If $A \subseteq P_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(r)}$, $B \subseteq P_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}^{(s)}$, and each sequence in A meets each sequence in B properly, then*

$$|A||B| \leq \left(\sum_{I \in \binom{[m] \setminus \{1\}}{r-1}} \prod_{i \in I} c_i \right) \left(\sum_{J \in \binom{[n] \setminus \{1\}}{s-1}} \prod_{j \in J} d_j \right),$$

and equality holds if $A = \{(a_1, \dots, a_m) \in P_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(r)} : a_1 = 1\}$ and $B = \{(b_1, \dots, b_n) \in P_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}^{(s)} : b_1 = 1\}$.

Thus, for $c_1 \geq 3$, Theorem 1.1 is the special case when $r = s = m = n$ and $(c_1, \dots, c_m) = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$. In general, Theorem 1.2 does not hold for $c_1 = 1$; indeed, if $c_1 = \dots = c_m = d_1 = \dots = d_n = 1$, $m = n$ and $m/2 < r = s < m$, then any two sequences in $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(r)}$ meet properly, and hence we can take $A = B = P_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(r)}$. The case when $c_1 = 2$ or $d_1 = 2$ needs special treatment and will be dealt with in a forthcoming paper.

Each of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2 generalises to one for any $k \geq 2$ subsets. Theorem 1.1 generalises as follows.

Corollary 1.3 *If $c_1, \dots, c_n$ are integers, $1 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$, $A_1, \dots, A_k \subseteq S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$, and for any $p, q \in [k]$ with $p \neq q$, each sequence in A_p meets each sequence in A_q , then*

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |A_i| \leq \left(\frac{|S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}|}{c_1} \right)^k = \left(\frac{1}{c_1} \prod_{i=1}^n c_i \right)^k,$$

and equality holds if $A_1 = \dots = A_k = \{(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in S_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} : a_1 = 1\}$.

The proof of the above corollary is the same as the one below for the generalisation of Theorem 1.2.

Corollary 1.4 *Let $c_{1,1}, \dots, c_{1,n_1}, \dots, c_{k,1}, \dots, c_{k,n_k}, r_1, \dots, r_k$ be integers such that for each $i \in [k]$, $3 \leq c_{i,1} \leq \dots \leq c_{i,n_i}$ and $r_i \in [n_i]$. If $A_1 \subseteq P_{(c_{1,1}, \dots, c_{1,n_1})}^{(r_1)}, \dots, A_k \subseteq P_{(c_{k,1}, \dots, c_{k,n_k})}^{(r_k)}$, and for any $p, q \in [k]$ with $p \neq q$, each sequence in A_p meets each sequence in A_q properly, then*

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |A_i| \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{I \in \binom{[n_i] \setminus \{1\}}{r_i-1}} \prod_{j \in I} c_{i,j} \right),$$

and equality holds if $A_i = \{(a_1, \dots, a_{n_i}) \in P_{(c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,n_i})}^{(r_i)} : a_1 = 1\}$ for each $i \in [k]$.

Proof. For each $i \in [k]$, let $x_i = |A_i|$ and $y_i = |\{(a_1, \dots, a_{n_i}) \in P_{(c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,n_i})}^{(r_i)} : a_1 = 1\}|$. By Theorem 1.2, $x_p x_q \leq y_p y_q$ for any $p, q \in [k]$ with $p \neq q$. Let mod^* be the usual modulo operation with the exception that for any two integers s and $t > 0$, $(st) \text{mod}^* t$ is t instead of 0. We have

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\prod_{i=1}^k x_i \right)^2 &= (x_1 x_2)(x_3 \text{mod}^* k x_4 \text{mod}^* k) \cdots (x_{(2k-1) \text{mod}^* k} x_{(2k) \text{mod}^* k}) \\ &\leq (y_1 y_2)(y_3 \text{mod}^* k y_4 \text{mod}^* k) \cdots (y_{(2k-1) \text{mod}^* k} y_{(2k) \text{mod}^* k}) = \left(\prod_{i=1}^k y_i \right)^2 \end{aligned}$$

and hence $\prod_{i=1}^k x_i \leq \prod_{i=1}^k y_i$. Hence the result. $\square$

The above results can be re-phrased in terms of families of sets as follows.

We say that a set A *intersects* a set B if A and B contain at least one common element (i.e. $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$). If $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ are families of sets such that for any i and j in $[k]$ with $i \neq j$, each set in $\mathcal{A}_i$ intersects each set in $\mathcal{A}_j$, then $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ are said to be *cross-intersecting*.

For any positive integers $c_1, \dots, c_n$ and r , let $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ denote the family of all sets $\{(i_1, a_{i_1}), \dots, (i_r, a_{i_r})\}$ such that $i_1, \dots, i_r$ are distinct elements of $[n]$, and $a_{i_j} \in [c_{i_j}]$ for each j in $[r]$; that is,

$$\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)} = \left\{ \{(i_1, a_{i_1}), \dots, (i_r, a_{i_r})\} : \{i_1, \dots, i_r\} \in \binom{[n]}{r}, a_{i_j} \in [c_{i_j}] \text{ for each } j \in [r] \right\}.$$

We call a set in $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ a *labeled set*. We may abbreviate $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(n)}$ to $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$; note that $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} = \{\{(1, a_1), \dots, (n, a_n)\} : a_i \in [c_i] \text{ for each } i \in [n]\}$.

Remark 1.5 There is an obvious one-to-one correspondence between $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ and $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$. Indeed, let $f: P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ be the function that maps any sequence $(a_1, \dots, a_n)$ in $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$ to $\{(i, a_i) : i \in [n], a_i \neq 0\}$; then f is a bijection. Moreover, a sequence $\mathbf{a}$ in $P_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(r)}$ meets a sequence $\mathbf{b}$ in $P_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}^{(s)}$ properly if and only if the corresponding sets $A = \{(i_1, a_{i_1}), \dots, (i_r, a_{i_r})\}$ and $B = \{(j_1, b_{j_1}), \dots, (j_s, b_{j_s})\}$ intersect, where $a_{i_1}, \dots, a_{i_r}$ and $b_{j_1}, \dots, b_{j_s}$ are the non-zero entries of $\mathbf{a}$ and $\mathbf{b}$, respectively; indeed, A and B intersect if and only if $(i_p, a_{i_p}) = (j_q, b_{j_q})$ for some p and q , and by the definition of a tuple, $(i_p, a_{i_p}) = (j_q, b_{j_q})$ if and only if $i_p = j_q$ and $a_{i_p} = b_{j_q}$.

Therefore, Corollary 1.3 can be re-phrased as follows.

Theorem 1.6 *If $c_1, \dots, c_n$ are integers, $1 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$, $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$, and $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ are cross-intersecting, then*

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |\mathcal{A}_i| \leq \left(\frac{|\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}|}{c_1} \right)^k = \left(\frac{1}{c_1} \prod_{i=1}^n c_i \right)^k,$$

and equality holds if $\mathcal{A}_1 = \dots = \mathcal{A}_k = \{A \in \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)} : (1, 1) \in A\}$.

The analogous result for the maximum sum of sizes of $k \geq 2$ cross-intersecting sub-families of $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}$ is given in [1]. The problem of determining the maximum sum or the maximum product of sizes of cross-intersecting sub-families of a given family $\mathcal{F}$ has recently attracted much attention; [2] provides some general results and outlines most of the known results for various important families $\mathcal{F}$.

As explained in Remark 1.5, Corollary 1.4 is equivalent to the following general cross-intersection result.

Theorem 1.7 *Let $c_{1,1}, \dots, c_{1,n_1}, \dots, c_{k,1}, \dots, c_{k,n_k}, r_1, \dots, r_k$ be as in Corollary 1.4. If $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_{1,1}, \dots, c_{1,n_1})}^{(r_1)}, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_{k,1}, \dots, c_{k,n_k})}^{(r_k)}$, and $\mathcal{A}_1, \dots, \mathcal{A}_k$ are cross-intersecting, then*

$$\prod_{i=1}^k |\mathcal{A}_i| \leq \prod_{i=1}^k \left(\sum_{I \in \binom{[n_i] \setminus \{1\}}{r_i - 1}} \prod_{j \in I} c_{i,j} \right),$$

and equality holds if $\mathcal{A}_i = \{A \in \mathcal{L}_{(c_{i,1}, \dots, c_{i,n_i})}^{(r_i)} : (1, 1) \in A\}$ for each $i \in [k]$.

We now start working towards the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2. The next section is dedicated to some basic results we need about the *compression* operation, which is a very useful tool in extremal set theory. Then, using compressions, in Section 3 we prove a cross-intersection result for *weighted* sets, and from this we obtain the proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2, given in Section 4.

2 The compression operation

For any $i, j \in [n]$, let $\delta_{i,j}: 2^{[n]} \rightarrow 2^{[n]}$ be defined by

$$\delta_{i,j}(A) = \begin{cases} (A \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\} & \text{if } j \in A \text{ and } i \notin A; \\ A & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}$$

and let $\Delta_{i,j}: 2^{2^{[n]}} \rightarrow 2^{2^{[n]}}$ be the *compression operation* (see [3]) defined by

$$\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\delta_{i,j}(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}, \delta_{i,j}(A) \notin \mathcal{A}\} \cup \{A \in \mathcal{A} : \delta_{i,j}(A) \in \mathcal{A}\}.$$

Note that $|\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{A})| = |\mathcal{A}|$. [4] provides a survey on the properties and uses of compression (also called *shifting*) operations in extremal set theory. We will need the following basic result, which we prove for completeness.

Lemma 2.1 *Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ be cross-intersecting sub-families of $2^{[n]}$, and let $i, j \in [n]$. Then $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{B})$ are cross-intersecting sub-families of $2^{[n]}$.*

Proof. Suppose $A \in \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{A})$ and $B \in \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{B})$. If $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B \in \mathcal{B}$, then $A \cap B \neq \emptyset$ since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting. Suppose $A \notin \mathcal{A}$ or $B \notin \mathcal{B}$; we may assume that $A \notin \mathcal{A}$. Then $A = \delta_{i,j}(A') \neq A'$ for some $A' \in \mathcal{A}$. So $i \notin A'$, $j \in A'$, $i \in A$ and $j \notin A$. Suppose $A \cap B = \emptyset$. So $i \notin B$ and hence $B \in \mathcal{B}$. So $B \in \mathcal{B} \cap \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{B})$ and hence $B, \delta_{i,j}(B) \in \mathcal{B}$. So $A' \cap B \neq \emptyset$ and $A' \cap \delta_{i,j}(B) \neq \emptyset$. From $A \cap B = \emptyset$ and $A' \cap B \neq \emptyset$ we get $A' \cap B = \{j\}$, but this yields the contradiction that $A' \cap \delta_{i,j}(B) = \emptyset$. $\square$

If $i < j$, then we call $\Delta_{i,j}$ a *left-compression*. A family $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ is said to be *compressed* if $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathcal{F}$ for any $i, j \in [n]$ with $i < j$. In other words, $\mathcal{F}$ is compressed if it is invariant under left-compressions. Note that $\mathcal{F}$ is compressed if and only if $(F \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\} \in \mathcal{F}$ whenever $1 \leq i < j \in F \in \mathcal{F}$ and $i \in [n] \setminus F$.

Suppose a sub-family $\mathcal{A}$ of $2^{[n]}$ is not compressed. Then $\mathcal{A}$ can be transformed to a compressed family through left-compressions as follows. Since $\mathcal{A}$ is not compressed, we can find a left-compression that changes $\mathcal{A}$, and we apply it to $\mathcal{A}$ to obtain a new sub-family of $2^{[n]}$. We keep on repeating this (always applying a left-compression to the last family obtained) until we obtain a sub-family of $2^{[n]}$ that is invariant under any left-compression (such a point is indeed reached, because if $\Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F}) \neq \mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ and $i < j$, then $0 < \sum_{G \in \Delta_{i,j}(\mathcal{F})} \sum_{b \in G} b < \sum_{F \in \mathcal{F}} \sum_{a \in F} a$).

Now consider $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting. Then, by Lemma 2.1, we can obtain $\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{B}^* \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^*$ are compressed and cross-intersecting, $|\mathcal{A}^*| = |\mathcal{A}|$ and $|\mathcal{B}^*| = |\mathcal{B}|$. Indeed, similarly to the above procedure, if we can find a left-compression that changes at least one of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, then we apply it to both $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$, and we keep on repeating this (always performing this on the last two families obtained) until we obtain $\mathcal{A}^*, \mathcal{B}^* \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ such that both $\mathcal{A}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^*$ are invariant under any left-compression.

3 A cross-intersection theorem for weighted sets

Let $\mathbb{R}^+$ denote the set of non-negative real numbers. For any non-empty family $\mathcal{F}$, any function $w: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ (which we call a *weight function*), and any $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{F}$, we denote the sum $\sum_{A \in \mathcal{A}} w(A)$ (of *weights* of sets in $\mathcal{A}$) by $w^{(\mathcal{F})}(\mathcal{A})$. Note that if $\mathcal{A}$ is empty, then $w^{(\mathcal{F})}(\mathcal{A})$ is the *empty sum* and we will adopt the convention of taking this to be 0.

If x is an element of a set X and $\mathcal{F} \subseteq 2^X$, then we denote the family $\{F \in \mathcal{F}: x \in F\}$ by $\mathcal{F}(x)$.

A family $\mathcal{H}$ is said to be *hereditary* if for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$, all the subsets of H are in $\mathcal{H}$. Thus, a family is hereditary if and only if it is a union of power sets.

Theorem 3.1 *Let $m, n \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^{[m]}$ and $\emptyset \neq \mathcal{H} \subseteq 2^{[n]}$ such that $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are hereditary and compressed. For each $\mathcal{F} \in \{\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}\}$, let $w_{\mathcal{F}}: \mathcal{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that*

- (a) $w_{\mathcal{F}}(A) \geq 2w_{\mathcal{F}}(B)$ for any $A, B \in \mathcal{F}$ with $A \subsetneq B$, and
- (b) $w_{\mathcal{F}}(\delta_{i,j}(C)) \geq w_{\mathcal{F}}(C)$ for any $C \in \mathcal{F}$ and any $i, j \in [\max\{m, n\}]$ with $i < j$.

Let $g = w_{\mathcal{G}}$ and $h = w_{\mathcal{H}}$. If $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting, then

$$g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) \leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1)).$$

Proof. By induction on $m + n$. The basis is $m + n = 2$ with $m = n = 1$, in which case the result is trivial. Now consider $m + n > 2$. We may assume that $m \leq n$. If $m = 1$, then the result is trivial too, so we consider $m \geq 2$. If at least one of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ is $\{\emptyset\}$, then we trivially have $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) = 0 = g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1))$. Thus, we will assume that $\mathcal{G} \neq \{\emptyset\}$ and $\mathcal{H} \neq \{\emptyset\}$, meaning that each of $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ contain at least one non-empty set.

As explained in Section 2, we apply left-compressions to $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ simultaneously until we obtain two compressed families $\mathcal{A}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^*$, respectively, and we know that $\mathcal{A}^*$ and $\mathcal{B}^*$ are cross-intersecting, $|\mathcal{A}^*| = |\mathcal{A}|$ and $|\mathcal{B}^*| = |\mathcal{B}|$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are compressed, we have $\mathcal{A}^* \subset \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{B}^* \subset \mathcal{H}$. From (b) we obtain $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}) \leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}^*)$ and $h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) \leq h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}^*)$. We may therefore assume that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are compressed.

Define $\mathcal{H}_0 = \{H \in \mathcal{H}: n \notin H\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 = \{H \setminus \{n\}: n \in H \in \mathcal{H}\}$. Define $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ similarly. Since $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are compressed, we clearly have that $\mathcal{A}_0, \mathcal{A}_1, \mathcal{B}_0, \mathcal{B}_1, \mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ are compressed. Since $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are hereditary, we clearly have that $\mathcal{G}_0, \mathcal{G}_1, \mathcal{H}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ are hereditary, $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0$. If $\mathcal{G}_1 = \emptyset$, then $\mathcal{G} \subseteq 2^{[m-1]}$ and hence we obtain the result immediately from the induction hypothesis. The same occurs if $\mathcal{H}_1 = \emptyset$. So we assume that $\mathcal{G}_1$ and $\mathcal{H}_1$ are non-empty. Since $\mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0$, $\mathcal{G}_0$ and $\mathcal{H}_0$ are non-empty too. Obviously, we have $\mathcal{A}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_0 \subseteq 2^{[m-1]}$, $\mathcal{A}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{G}_1 \subseteq 2^{[m-1]}$, $\mathcal{B}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_0 \subseteq 2^{[n-1]}$ and $\mathcal{B}_1 \subseteq \mathcal{H}_1 \subseteq 2^{[n-1]}$.

Let $h_0: \mathcal{H}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $h_0(H) = h(H)$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}_0$. Let $h_1: \mathcal{H}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $h_1(H) = h(H \cup \{n\})$ for each $H \in \mathcal{H}_1$ (note that $H \cup \{n\} \in \mathcal{H}(n)$ by definition of $\mathcal{H}_1$). By (a) and (b), we have the following consequences. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{H}_0$ with $A \subsetneq B$,

$$h_0(A) = h(A) \geq 2h(B) = 2h_0(B). \quad (1)$$

For any $C \in \mathcal{H}_0$ and any $i, j \in [n-1]$ with $i < j$,

$$h_0(\delta_{i,j}(C)) = h(\delta_{i,j}(C)) \geq h(C) = h_0(C). \quad (2)$$

For any $A, B \in \mathcal{H}_1$ with $A \subsetneq B$,

$$h_1(A) = h(A \cup \{n\}) \geq 2h(B \cup \{n\}) = 2h_1(B). \quad (3)$$

For any $C \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and any $i, j \in [n-1]$ with $i < j$,

$$h_1(\delta_{i,j}(C)) = h(\delta_{i,j}(C) \cup \{n\}) = h(\delta_{i,j}(C \cup \{n\})) \geq h(C \cup \{n\}) = h_1(C). \quad (4)$$

Thus, we have shown that properties (a) and (b) are inherited by h_0 and h_1 .

Since $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}_0 \cup \mathcal{B}(n)$, $\mathcal{B}_0 \cap \mathcal{B}(n) = \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{B}(n) = \{B \cup \{n\} : B \in \mathcal{B}_1\}$, we have

$$h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) = h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}_0) + h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}(n)) = h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0) + h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{B}_1). \quad (5)$$

Along the same lines,

$$\begin{aligned} h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1)) &= h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}_0(1)) + h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\{H \in \mathcal{H} : 1, n \in H\}) \\ &= h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{H}_0(1)) + h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\{H \cup \{n\} : H \in \mathcal{H}_1(1)\}) \\ &= h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{H}_0(1)) + h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{H}_1(1)). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Suppose $m < n$. Clearly, $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}_0$ are cross-intersecting. Since $m < n$, no set in $\mathcal{A}$ contains n , and hence $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ are cross-intersecting. Thus, by the induction hypothesis,

$$g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h_j^{(\mathcal{H}_j)}(\mathcal{B}_j) \leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h_j^{(\mathcal{H}_j)}(\mathcal{H}_j(1)) \quad \text{for each } j \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Together with (5) and (6), this gives us

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) &= g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0) + g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{B}_1) \\ &\leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{H}_0(1)) + g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{H}_1(1)) \\ &= g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1)), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Now suppose $m = n$. Similarly to h_0 and h_1 , let $g_0 : \mathcal{G}_0 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $g_0(G) = g(G)$ for each $G \in \mathcal{G}_0$, and let $g_1 : \mathcal{G}_1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^+$ such that $g_1(G) = g(G \cup \{n\})$ for each $G \in \mathcal{G}_1$ (note that since $m = n$, $G \cup \{n\} \in \mathcal{G}(n)$ by definition of $\mathcal{G}_1$). Then properties (a) and (b) are inherited by g_0 and g_1 in the same way they are inherited by h_0 and h_1 as shown above; that is, similarly to (1)–(4), we have the following. For any $A, B \in \mathcal{G}_0$ with $A \subsetneq B$,

$$g_0(A) \geq 2g_0(B). \quad (7)$$

For any $C \in \mathcal{G}_0$ and any $i, j \in [n-1]$ with $i < j$,

$$g_0(\delta_{i,j}(C)) \geq g_0(C). \quad (8)$$

For any $A, B \in \mathcal{G}_1$ with $A \subsetneq B$,

$$g_1(A) \geq 2g_1(B). \quad (9)$$

For any $C \in \mathcal{G}_1$ and any $i, j \in [n-1]$ with $i < j$,

$$g_1(\delta_{i,j}(C)) \geq g_1(C). \quad (10)$$

Similarly to (5) and (6), we have

$$g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}) = g_0^{(\mathcal{G}_0)}(\mathcal{A}_0) + g_1^{(\mathcal{G}_1)}(\mathcal{A}_1), \quad (11)$$

$$g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1)) = g_0^{(\mathcal{G}_0)}(\mathcal{G}_0(1)) + g_1^{(\mathcal{G}_1)}(\mathcal{G}_1(1)). \quad (12)$$

Clearly, $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_0$ are cross-intersecting, and since $n = m$, so are $\mathcal{A}_0$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$, and also $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_0$.

Case 1: $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ are cross-intersecting too. Then, by the induction hypothesis,

$$g_i^{(\mathcal{G}_i)}(\mathcal{A}_i)h_j^{(\mathcal{H}_j)}(\mathcal{B}_j) \leq g_i^{(\mathcal{G}_i)}(\mathcal{G}_i(1))h_j^{(\mathcal{H}_j)}(\mathcal{H}_j(1)) \quad \text{for any } i, j \in \{0, 1\}.$$

Together with (5), (6), (11) and (12), this gives us

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) &= g_0^{(\mathcal{G}_0)}(\mathcal{A}_0)h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0) + g_0^{(\mathcal{G}_0)}(\mathcal{A}_0)h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{B}_1) + \\ &\quad g_1^{(\mathcal{G}_1)}(\mathcal{A}_1)h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{B}_0) + g_1^{(\mathcal{G}_1)}(\mathcal{A}_1)h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{B}_1) \\ &\leq g_0^{(\mathcal{G}_0)}(\mathcal{G}_0(1))h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{H}_0(1)) + g_0^{(\mathcal{G}_0)}(\mathcal{G}_0(1))h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{H}_1(1)) + \\ &\quad g_1^{(\mathcal{G}_1)}(\mathcal{G}_1(1))h_0^{(\mathcal{H}_0)}(\mathcal{H}_0(1)) + g_1^{(\mathcal{G}_1)}(\mathcal{G}_1(1))h_1^{(\mathcal{H}_1)}(\mathcal{H}_1(1)) \\ &= g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1)), \end{aligned}$$

as required.

Case 2: $\mathcal{A}_1$ and $\mathcal{B}_1$ are not cross-intersecting. Then there exists $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$ such that $A \cap B = \emptyset$ for some $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$. Let $\mathcal{C}^{(0)} = \{A \in \mathcal{A}_1 : A \cap B = \emptyset \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}_1\}$, and let $A_1, \dots, A_k$ be the distinct sets in $\mathcal{C}^{(0)}$. For each $i \in [k]$, let $B_i = [n-1] \setminus A_i$, $A'_i = A_i \cup \{n\}$, $B'_i = B_i \cup \{n\}$. For each $i \in [k]$, $A'_i \in \mathcal{A}$ since $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_1$.

Let $j \in [k]$. Let $\mathcal{D}_j = \{B \in \mathcal{B}_1 : A_j \cap B = \emptyset\}$. Suppose there exists $B \in \mathcal{D}_j$ such that $B \neq B_j$. Then $B \subsetneq [n-1] \setminus A_j$ and hence $[n-1] \setminus (A_j \cup B) \neq \emptyset$. Let $c \in [n-1] \setminus (A_j \cup B)$. Since $B \in \mathcal{B}_1$, $B \cup \{n\} \in \mathcal{B}$. Let $C = \delta_{c,n}(B \cup \{n\})$. Since $c \notin B \cup \{n\}$, $C = B \cup \{c\}$. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is compressed, $C \in \mathcal{B}$. However, since $c \notin A'_j$ and $A_j \cap B = \emptyset$, we have $A'_j \cap C = \emptyset$, which is a contradiction as $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting. So $\mathcal{D}_j \subseteq \{B_j\}$. By definition of A_j , $\mathcal{D}_j \neq \emptyset$ and hence $\mathcal{D}_j = \{B_j\}$.

We have therefore shown that

$$\text{for each } i \in [k], B_i \text{ is the unique set in } \mathcal{B}_1 \text{ that does not intersect } A_i, \quad (13)$$

and $B'_i \in \mathcal{B}$ (since $B_i \in \mathcal{B}_1$). It follows from (13) that

$$\text{for each } i \in [k], A_i \text{ is the unique set in } \mathcal{A}_1 \text{ that does not intersect } B_i. \quad (14)$$

Indeed, suppose $A \in \mathcal{A}_1$ and $j \in [k]$ such that $A \cap B_j = \emptyset$. Then $A \in \mathcal{C}^{(0)}$. So $A = A_i$ for some $i \in [k]$. By (13), $B_j = B_i$. So $i = j$ as $B_1, \dots, B_k$ are distinct. So $A = A_j$.

Since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are compressed,

$$\text{for any } p \in [n-1] \text{ and any } i \in [k], \delta_{p,n}(A'_i) \in \mathcal{A} \text{ and } \delta_{p,n}(B'_i) \in \mathcal{B}. \quad (15)$$

Consider A_1 and B_1 . Since $A_1 \cap B'_1 = A_1 \cap B_1 = \emptyset$ and $B_1 \cap A'_1 = B_1 \cap A_1 = \emptyset$, $A_1 \notin \mathcal{A}$ and $B_1 \notin \mathcal{B}$. Let $\mathcal{A}' = \mathcal{A} \cup \{A_1\}$, $\mathcal{A}'' = \mathcal{A} \setminus \{A'_1\}$, $\mathcal{B}' = \mathcal{B} \setminus \{B'_1\}$, $\mathcal{B}'' = \mathcal{B} \cup \{B_1\}$. Since $\mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{H}$ are hereditary, and since $A'_1 \in \mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and $B'_1 \in \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, we have $A_1 \in \mathcal{G}$ and $B_1 \in \mathcal{H}$, and hence $\mathcal{A}', \mathcal{A}'' \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{B}', \mathcal{B}'' \in \mathcal{H}$. Let $x = g^{\mathcal{G}}(\mathcal{A})$ and $x_1 = g(A'_1)$. Let $y = h^{\mathcal{H}}(\mathcal{B})$ and $y_1 = h(B'_1)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}') &= x + g(A_1) \geq x + 2g(A'_1) = x + 2x_1, \\ g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}'') &= x - g(A'_1) = x - x_1, \\ h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}') &= y - h(B'_1) = y - y_1, \\ h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}'') &= y + h(B_1) \geq y + 2h(B'_1) = y + 2y_1. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}') < g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$ and $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}'')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}'') < g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} (x + 2x_1)(y - y_1) &< xy \quad \text{and} \quad (x - x_1)(y + 2y_1) < xy \\ \Rightarrow 2x_1y &< xy_1 + 2x_1y_1 \quad \text{and} \quad 2y_1x < x_1y + 2x_1y_1 \\ \Rightarrow 2x_1y + 2y_1x &< (y_1x + 2x_1y_1) + (x_1y + 2x_1y_1) \\ \Rightarrow x_1y + y_1x &< 4x_1y_1. \end{aligned}$$

Suppose $A_1 = \emptyset$. Then $A'_1 = \{n\}$ and $B'_1 = [n]$. By (15), the sets $\{1\}, \dots, \{n\}$ are all in $\mathcal{A}$, and obviously no proper subset of $[n]$ intersects each of these sets. Thus, by the cross-intersection condition, B'_1 is the only set that is in $\mathcal{B}$. So $h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}'') = h(B'_1) + h(B_1) \geq h(B'_1) + 2h(B'_1) = 3h(B'_1) = 3h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$. Since $\{1\}, \{n\} \in \mathcal{A}$ and $A'_1 = \{n\}$, we have $2g(A'_1) \leq g(A'_1) + g(\delta_{1,n}(A'_1)) = g(\{n\}) + g(\{1\}) \leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})$ and hence $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}'') = g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}) - g(A'_1) \geq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})/2$. So we obtain $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}'')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}'') \geq (g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})/2)(3h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}))$, which contradicts $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}'')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}'') < g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$. So $A_1 \neq \emptyset$. Also, $B_1 \neq \emptyset$ because otherwise, by the same argument, we obtain $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}') \geq (3g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}))(h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})/2)$, which contradicts $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}') < g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$. Since $A_1 \neq \emptyset \neq B_1$, it follows by definition of B_1 that $[n-1] \setminus A_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $[n-1] \setminus B_1 \neq \emptyset$. Let $a \in [n-1] \setminus A_1$ and $b \in [n-1] \setminus B_1$. Let $A''_1 = \delta_{a,n}(A'_1)$ and $B''_1 = \delta_{b,n}(B'_1)$. So $A''_1 \neq A'_1$ and $B''_1 \neq B'_1$. By (15), $A''_1 \in \mathcal{A}$ and $B''_1 \in \mathcal{B}$. By (b), $g(A''_1) \geq g(A'_1)$ and $h(B''_1) \geq h(B'_1)$. We therefore have $x \geq x_1 + g(A''_1) \geq 2x_1$ and $y \geq y_1 + h(B''_1) \geq 2y_1$. This gives us $x_1y + y_1x \geq x_1(2y_1) + y_1(2x_1) = 4x_1y_1$, which contradicts $x_1y + y_1x < 4x_1y_1$.

Therefore, either $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}') \geq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$ holds or $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}'')h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}'') \geq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$ holds. If the former inequality holds, then we set $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = \mathcal{A}'$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)} = \mathcal{B}'$, otherwise we set $\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = \mathcal{A}''$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)} = \mathcal{B}''$. Let $\mathcal{A}_1^{(1)} = \{A \setminus \{n\} : n \in A \in \mathcal{A}^{(1)}\}$ and $\mathcal{B}_1^{(1)} = \{B \setminus \{n\} : n \in B \in \mathcal{B}^{(1)}\}$. Let $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \{A \in \mathcal{A}_1^{(1)} : A \cap B = \emptyset \text{ for some } B \in \mathcal{B}_1^{(1)}\}$. Note that by (13) and (14), $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ are cross-intersecting and $\mathcal{C}^{(1)} = \mathcal{C}^{(0)} \setminus \{A_1\}$. Thus, if $k \geq 2$, then the argument by which we inserted A_1 to $\mathcal{A}$ or B_1 to $\mathcal{B}$, and removed B'_1 from $\mathcal{B}$ or A'_1 from $\mathcal{A}$, respectively, to obtain $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(1)}$ can be repeated

for A_2 and B_2 , and so on until it is finally repeated for A_k and B_k . We therefore obtain a family $\mathcal{A}^{(k)} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ and a family $\mathcal{B}^{(k)} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ such that $\mathcal{A}^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(k)}$ are cross-intersecting,

$$(A \setminus \{n\}) \cap (B \setminus \{n\}) \neq \emptyset \text{ for any } A \in \mathcal{A}^{(k)} \text{ and any } B \in \mathcal{B}^{(k)} \quad (16)$$

(since we obtain $\mathcal{C}^{(i)} = \mathcal{C}^{(i-1)} \setminus \{A_i\}$ for each $i \in [k]$, which inductively yields $\mathcal{C}^{(i)} = \mathcal{C}^{(0)} \setminus \{A_1, \dots, A_i\}$ for each $i \in [k]$, and hence $\mathcal{C}^{(k)} = \emptyset$), and $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}^{(k)}) \geq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B})$. Let $\mathcal{A}_0^{(k)} = \{A \in \mathcal{A}^{(k)} : n \notin A\}$ and $\mathcal{A}_1^{(k)} = \{A \setminus \{n\} : n \in A \in \mathcal{A}^{(k)}\}$, and define $\mathcal{B}_0^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_1^{(k)}$ similarly. By (16), for any $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$, $\mathcal{A}_i^{(k)}$ and $\mathcal{B}_j^{(k)}$ are cross-intersecting. Therefore, as in Case 1, we obtain

$$g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A}^{(k)})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}^{(k)}) \leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1)),$$

and hence $g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{A})h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{B}) \leq g^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{G}(1))h^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{H}(1))$. $\square$

4 Proofs of Theorems 1.1 and 1.2

We now define a compression operation for labeled sets. For any $x, y \in \mathbb{N}$, let

$$\gamma_{x,y}(A) = \begin{cases} A \setminus \{(x, y)\} \cup \{(x, 1)\} & \text{if } (x, y) \in A; \\ A & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

for any labeled set A , and let

$$\Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{A}) = \{\gamma_{x,y}(A) : A \in \mathcal{A}, \gamma_{x,y}(A) \notin \mathcal{A}\} \cup \{A \in \mathcal{A} : \gamma_{x,y}(A) \in \mathcal{A}\}$$

for any family $\mathcal{A}$ of labeled sets.

Note that $|\Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{A})| = |\mathcal{A}|$ and that if $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$, then $\Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{A}) \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$. It is easy to check that if $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting families of labeled sets, then so are $\Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{B})$. We prove more than this.

The *Cartesian product* of two sets X and Y , denoted by $X \times Y$, is the set $\{(x, y) : x \in X, y \in Y\}$. For any $r \in [n]$, let $\mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(\leq r)}$ denote the union $\bigcup_{i=1}^r \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(i)}$.

Lemma 4.1 *Let $c_1, \dots, c_m, d_1, \dots, d_n, x, y \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $1 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_m$, $1 \leq d_1 \leq \dots \leq d_n$, and $y \geq 2$. Let $l = \max\{m, n\}$ and $h = \max\{c_m, d_n\}$. Let $V \subseteq [l] \times ([h] \setminus \{1\})$. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(\leq m)}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}^{(\leq n)}$ such that $(A \cap B) \setminus V \neq \emptyset$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}$ and any $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Then $(C \cap D) \setminus (V \cup \{(x, y)\}) \neq \emptyset$ for any $C \in \Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{A})$ and any $D \in \Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{B})$.*

Proof. Let $C \in \Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{A})$ and $D \in \Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{B})$. We first show that $(C \cap D) \setminus V \neq \emptyset$. Let $C' = (C \setminus \{(x, 1)\}) \cup \{(x, y)\}$ and $D' = (D \setminus \{(x, 1)\}) \cup \{(x, y)\}$. If $C \in \mathcal{A}$ and $D \in \mathcal{B}$, then $(C \cap D) \setminus V \neq \emptyset$. If $C \notin \mathcal{A}$ and $D \notin \mathcal{B}$, then $(x, 1)$ is in both C and D , and hence, since $(x, 1) \notin V$, $(x, 1) \in (C \cap D) \setminus V$. Suppose $C \notin \mathcal{A}$ and $D \in \mathcal{B}$. So $(x, 1) \in C$ and $C' \in \mathcal{A}$. If $(x, y) \notin D$, then, since $C' \in \mathcal{A}$ and $D \in \mathcal{B}$, $0 < |(C' \cap D) \setminus V| \leq |(C \cap D) \setminus V|$. If $(x, y) \in D$, then $\gamma_{x,y}(D) \in \mathcal{B}$ (because otherwise $D \notin \Gamma_{x,y}(\mathcal{B})$), and hence, since $C' \in \mathcal{A}$, $0 < |(C' \cap \gamma_{x,y}(D)) \setminus V| = |(C \cap D) \setminus V|$. Similarly, if $C \in \mathcal{A}$ and $D \notin \mathcal{B}$, then $(C \cap D) \setminus V \neq \emptyset$.

Now suppose $(C \cap D) \setminus (V \cup \{(x, y)\}) = \emptyset$. Since $(C \cap D) \setminus V \neq \emptyset$, $(x, y) \in C \cap D$. So $C, \gamma_{x,y}(C) \in \mathcal{A}$, $D, \gamma_{x,y}(D) \in \mathcal{B}$ and $|(C \cap \gamma_{x,y}(D)) \setminus V| = |(C \cap D) \setminus (V \cup \{(x, y)\})| = 0$, a contradiction. $\square$

Corollary 4.2 Let $c_1, \dots, c_m, d_1, \dots, d_n, h, l$ be as in Lemma 4.1. Let $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_m)}^{(\leq m)}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{(d_1, \dots, d_n)}^{(\leq n)}$ such that $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting. Let

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^* &= \Gamma_{l,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{l,2} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,2} \circ \Gamma_{1,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{1,2}(\mathcal{A}), \\ \mathcal{B}^* &= \Gamma_{l,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{l,2} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,2} \circ \Gamma_{1,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{1,2}(\mathcal{B}).\end{aligned}$$

Then $A \cap B \cap ([l] \times [1]) \neq \emptyset$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and any $B \in \mathcal{B}^*$.

Proof. Let $Z = [l] \times ([h] \setminus \{1\})$. By repeated application of Lemma 4.1, $(A \cap B) \setminus Z \neq \emptyset$ for any $A \in \mathcal{A}^*$ and any $B \in \mathcal{B}^*$. The result follows since $(A \cap B) \setminus Z = A \cap B \cap ([l] \times [1])$. $\square$

Let $\delta_{i,j}$ be as in Section 2. For any set X and any $r \in \mathbb{N}$, let $\binom{X}{\leq r}$ denote the family $\{A \subseteq X : |A| \leq r\}$.

Lemma 4.3 Let $c_1, \dots, c_n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $3 \leq c_1 \leq \dots \leq c_n$. Let $r \in [n]$. Let $w : \binom{[n]}{\leq r} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $A \in \binom{[n]}{\leq r}$,

$$w(A) = \left| \left\{ L \in \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)} : L \cap ([n] \times [1]) = A \times [1] \right\} \right|.$$

Then:

- (i) $w(A) \geq 2w(A')$ for any $A, A' \in \binom{[n]}{\leq r}$ with $A \subsetneq A'$.
- (ii) $w(\delta_{i,j}(A)) \geq w(A)$ for any $A \in \binom{[n]}{\leq r}$ and any $i, j \in [n]$ with $i < j$.

Proof of Lemma 4.3. (i) Let $A, A' \in \binom{[n]}{\leq r}$ with $A \subsetneq A'$. Let $B = A' \setminus A$. So $|B| \geq 1$. For each $L \in \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)}$, let $\sigma(L) = \{i \in [n] : (i, a) \in L \text{ for some } a \in [c_i]\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}w(A) &\geq \left| \left\{ L \in \mathcal{L}_{(c_1, \dots, c_n)}^{(r)} : L \cap ([n] \times [1]) = A \times [1], B \subset \sigma(L) \right\} \right| \\ &= \sum_{E \in \binom{[n] \setminus (A \cup B)}{r - |A| - |B|}} \prod_{b \in B} (c_b - 1) \prod_{e \in E} (c_e - 1) = \prod_{b \in B} (c_b - 1) \left(\sum_{E \in \binom{[n] \setminus A'}{r - |A'|}} \prod_{e \in E} (c_e - 1) \right) \\ &= w(A') \prod_{b \in B} (c_b - 1) \geq 2^{|B|} w(A') \geq 2w(A').\end{aligned}$$

(ii) Let $A \in \binom{[n]}{\leq r}$, and let $i, j \in [n]$ with $i < j$. Suppose $\delta_{i,j}(A) \neq A$. Then $j \in A$, $i \notin A$ and $\delta_{i,j}(A) = (A \setminus \{j\}) \cup \{i\}$. Let $B = A \setminus \{j\}$, $\mathcal{E}_0 = \binom{[n] \setminus (B \cup \{i, j\})}{r - |A|}$, $\mathcal{E}_1 =$

$\left\{E \in \binom{[n] \setminus (B \cup \{i\})}{r-|A|} : j \in E\right\}$, $\mathcal{E}_2 = \left\{E \in \binom{[n] \setminus (B \cup \{j\})}{r-|A|} : i \in E\right\}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} w(B \cup \{i\}) &= \sum_{E \in \binom{[n] \setminus (B \cup \{i\})}{r-|A|}} \prod_{e \in E} (c_e - 1) = \sum_{D \in \mathcal{E}_0} \prod_{d \in D} (c_d - 1) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_1} \prod_{f \in F} (c_f - 1) \\ &\geq \sum_{D \in \mathcal{E}_0} \prod_{d \in D} (c_d - 1) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_1} \prod_{f \in F} (c_f - 1) \frac{c_i - 1}{c_j - 1} \quad (\text{since } c_i \leq c_j) \\ &= \sum_{D \in \mathcal{E}_0} \prod_{d \in D} (c_d - 1) + \sum_{F \in \mathcal{E}_2} \prod_{f \in F} (c_f - 1) = \sum_{E \in \binom{[n] \setminus (B \cup \{j\})}{r-|A|}} \prod_{e \in E} (c_e - 1) \\ &= w(B \cup \{j\}) \end{aligned}$$

and hence $w(\delta_{i,j}(A)) \geq w(A)$. $\square$

We now prove Theorem 1.2, and then we prove Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_m)$ and $\mathbf{d} = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$. Let $\mathcal{X} = \{X \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)} : (1, 1) \in X\}$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{Y \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(s)} : (1, 1) \in Y\}$. Let $f : P_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)}$ such that for each $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_m)$ in $P_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)}$, $f(\mathbf{a}) = \{(i, a_i) : i \in [m], a_i \neq 0\}$. Let $g : P_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)}$ such that for each $\mathbf{b} = (b_1, \dots, b_n)$ in $P_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)}$, $g(\mathbf{b}) = \{(j, b_j) : j \in [n], b_j \neq 0\}$. Let $\mathcal{A} = \{f(\mathbf{a}) : \mathbf{a} \in A\}$ and $\mathcal{B} = \{g(\mathbf{b}) : \mathbf{b} \in B\}$. So $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)}$ and $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)}$. As explained in Remark 1.5, $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting, $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)}| = |S_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)}|$, $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)}| = |S_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)}|$, $|\mathcal{A}| = |A|$ and $|\mathcal{B}| = |B|$. Thus, the result follows if we show that $|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|$.

Let $\mathcal{G} = \binom{[m]}{\leq r}$. Let $v : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $G \in \mathcal{G}$,

$$v(G) = \left| \left\{ L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)} : L \cap ([m] \times [1]) = G \times [1] \right\} \right|.$$

Let $\mathcal{H} = \binom{[n]}{\leq s}$. Let $w : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that for any $H \in \mathcal{H}$,

$$w(H) = \left| \left\{ L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)} : L \cap ([n] \times [1]) = H \times [1] \right\} \right|.$$

Let $l = \max\{m, n\}$ and $h = \max\{c_m, d_n\}$. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^* &= \Gamma_{l,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{l,2} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,2} \circ \Gamma_{1,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{1,2}(\mathcal{A}), \\ \mathcal{B}^* &= \Gamma_{l,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{l,2} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{2,2} \circ \Gamma_{1,h} \circ \dots \circ \Gamma_{1,2}(\mathcal{B}). \end{aligned}$$

Now let

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C} &= \{G \in \mathcal{G} : G \cap ([m] \times [1]) = G \times [1] \text{ for some } G \in \mathcal{A}^*\}, \\ \mathcal{D} &= \{H \in \mathcal{H} : H \cap ([n] \times [1]) = H \times [1] \text{ for some } H \in \mathcal{B}^*\}. \end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathcal{G}$, $\mathcal{D} \subseteq \mathcal{H}$, and by Corollary 4.2, $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ are cross-intersecting. We have $\mathcal{A}^* \subseteq \bigcup_{C \in \mathcal{C}} \{L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)} : L \cap ([m] \times [1]) = C \times [1]\}$ and $\mathcal{B}^* \subseteq \bigcup_{D \in \mathcal{D}} \{L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)} : L \cap ([n] \times [1]) = D \times [1]\}$. So $|\mathcal{A}^*| \leq \sum_{C \in \mathcal{C}} v(C) = v^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{C})$ and $|\mathcal{B}^*| \leq \sum_{D \in \mathcal{D}} w(D) = w^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{D})$. Since $|\mathcal{A}| = |\mathcal{A}^*|$ and $|\mathcal{B}| = |\mathcal{B}^*|$, we therefore have $|\mathcal{A}| \leq v^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{C})$ and $|\mathcal{B}| \leq w^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{D})$.

Let $\mathcal{I} = \{G \in \mathcal{G} : 1 \in G\}$ and $\mathcal{J} = \{H \in \mathcal{H} : 1 \in H\}$. By Lemma 4.3 and Theorem 3.1, $v^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{C})w^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{D}) \leq v^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{I})w^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{J})$. So

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| &\leq v^{(\mathcal{G})}(\mathcal{I})w^{(\mathcal{H})}(\mathcal{J}) = \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} v(I)\right) \left(\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} w(J)\right) \\
&= \left(\sum_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \left|\{L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)} : L \cap ([m] \times [1]) = I \times [1]\}\right|\right) \times \\
&\quad \left(\sum_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \left|\{L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)} : L \cap ([n] \times [1]) = J \times [1]\}\right|\right) \\
&= \left|\bigcup_{I \in \mathcal{I}} \{L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}^{(r)} : L \cap ([m] \times [1]) = I \times [1]\}\right| \times \\
&\quad \left|\bigcup_{J \in \mathcal{J}} \{L \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{d}}^{(s)} : L \cap ([n] \times [1]) = J \times [1]\}\right| \\
&= |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}|
\end{aligned}$$

as required. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 1.1. Let $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_n)$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A} &= \{\{(1, a_1), \dots, (n, a_n)\} : (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in A\}, \\
\mathcal{B} &= \{\{(1, b_1), \dots, (n, b_n)\} : (b_1, \dots, b_n) \in B\}.
\end{aligned}$$

So $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B} \subseteq \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}$, $|\mathcal{A}| = |A|$, $|\mathcal{B}| = |B|$, and as explained in Remark 1.5, $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting. Thus, since $|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}| = |S_{\mathbf{c}}|$, the result follows if we show that $|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| \leq \left(\frac{1}{c_1}|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|\right)^2$.

Since $|\mathcal{A}| \leq |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|$ and $|\mathcal{B}| \leq |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|$, the result is trivial if $c_1 = 1$.

Suppose $c_1 = 2$. Let mod^* be as in the proof of Corollary 1.4. Let $\theta : \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}} \rightarrow \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}$ such that $\theta(E) = \{(i, (j+1) \bmod^* c_i) : (i, j) \in E\}$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}$. Clearly, θ is a bijection, and $\theta(E) \cap E = \emptyset$ for any $E \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}$. Thus, since $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}$ are cross-intersecting, $\theta(C) \notin \mathcal{B}$ for any $C \in \mathcal{A}$, and hence $|\mathcal{B}| \leq |\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}| - |\mathcal{A}|$. Since $0 \leq (|\mathcal{A}| - \frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|)^2 = |\mathcal{A}|^2 - |\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}| + \frac{1}{4}|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|^2$, we have $|\mathcal{A}|(|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}| - |\mathcal{A}|) \leq \left(\frac{1}{2}|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|\right)^2$ and hence $|\mathcal{A}||\mathcal{B}| \leq \left(\frac{1}{c_1}|\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{c}}|\right)^2$.

Finally, if $c_1 \geq 3$, then the result is given by Theorem 1.2 with $r = s = m = n$ and $(c_1, \dots, c_m) = (d_1, \dots, d_n)$. $\square$

References

- [1] P. Borg, Intersecting and cross-intersecting families of labeled sets, Electron. J. Combin. 15 (2008), note paper N9.
- [2] P. Borg, The maximum sum and maximum product of sizes of cross-intersecting families, submitted, available at <http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.0667>.

- [3] P. Erdős, C. Ko, R. Rado, Intersection theorems for systems of finite sets, *Quart. J. Math. Oxford* (2) 12 (1961), 313–320.
- [4] P. Frankl, The shifting technique in extremal set theory, in: C. Whitehead (Ed.), *Combinatorial Surveys*, Cambridge Univ. Press, London/New York, 1987, pp. 81–110.